

**OLDER ADULT PERFORMANCE OUTCOME PILOT  
COMMITTEE MEETING SYNOPSIS  
June 8, 2000**

Jim Higgins, Department of Mental Health (DMH), led introductions and reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1). Representatives from the following counties were present: Astrid Beigel (Los Angeles County), Mary Flett (Santa Clara County), Carmen Stitt and Victor Contreras (Sacramento County), Sharon Lopez (Shasta County), Judith Hutchings (Sonoma County), and Luanna Smith (Tuolumne County). Chester Cochran represented consumers; and Jim Higgins, Karen Purvis, and Traci Fujita represented the DMH Research and Performance Outcome Development Unit.

The following agenda items were discussed:

- County Reports. Pilot county representatives each provided a brief status report on their county's progress. All counties had completed collection of first administration data by the end of April, and some have also completed or are close to completion of their second administrations. Luanna Smith, Tuolumne County, distributed a report summarizing data from their first administration (Attachment 2). Astrid Beigel, Los Angeles County, distributed a table showing differences among four clinics in the number of completed instruments (Attachment 3). Committee members also discussed various broad issues (e.g., types of data useful for performance outcomes; types of data better collected at the local rather than state level; maintaining staff enthusiasm; and which clients are not being included in performance outcomes). The committee also discussed what to do with clients who are due for intake, annual, or discharge administrations during the period after pilot data have been collected, but before formal implementation of the older adult performance outcome system. After discussing various ramifications, the group decided to allow each county to decide what strategy made most sense in their circumstance.
- Clinician-Administered Instruments. Jim Higgins discussed some pros and cons of clinician reports vs. self-reports for describing client functioning. The group questioned whether it was more important to use a standardized instrument to obtain this information or more helpful to use a well-designed face sheet (such as the one proposed for the Children's Performance Outcome Pilot).
- First Administration Results. Karen Purvis distributed a packet of tables showing first administration results as of May 15, 2000 (Attachment 4). Some additional data are still being sent in and will be included in the final report.
- Pilot Report Qualitative Questions. Karen Purvis re-distributed an outline (Attachment 5) suggesting the types of qualitative data that could be included in the final report in addition to the quantitative instrument data. Committee members discussed how they preferred to approach their individual reports and decided to allow flexibility of style as long as they addressed the major issues in the outline.
- The next meeting of the Older Adult Performance Outcome Pilot committee was scheduled for Thursday, July 20, 2000, conference room 100 of DMH.